

**DCSS P3 PROGRAM  
MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WORKGROUP  
OCTOBER 24, 2000  
MEETING SUMMARY**

**A. GENERAL**

On Tuesday, October 24, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Program, Management Practices Workgroup held a session in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Debbie Campora, FTB-CCSAS Project
- ☒ George Gliaudys Jr. (Co-Leader), LA County FSD
- ☒ Kevin Harrison, Orange County FSD
- ☒ Mary Herdegen, Placer County CEO
- ☒ David Jetton, LA Superior Court
- ☒ Lisa McCann, DCSS, Policy & Operations
- ☒ Cindy Moore, Sonoma County FSD
- ☒ Linda Patterson (Co-Leader), DCSS-Policy & Operations, Facilitator
- ☒ Pam Rouse, Ventura County FSD
- ☒ Terri Silveira-Love, Shasta County FSD
- ☒ Nora O'Brien, ACES
- ☒ Rachel Subega, Santa Clara County FSD

This meeting summary highlights points covered, material discussed, decisions made, and follow-up tasks for forthcoming sessions. Comments and corrections should be addressed to Debbie Campora at [debbie\\_campora@ftb.ca.gov](mailto:debbie_campora@ftb.ca.gov)

**B. REVIEW OF TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA**

*Larry Wilson* opened the discussion with an overview of our agenda and the objectives for this session.

- October through December Calendar
  - Fatherhood Conference 11/3
  - Final Recommendations due 11/7
  - LA Forum 11/13
  - Last Draft Final Reports published 11/15
  - Steering Committee Meeting 11/21
- Q&As for MP Workgroup
- Cost/Benefit Analysis (High, Medium, Low)
- Final report and recommendations
- Next steps – what direction the department should adopt for program strategy

We reviewed the calendar for the months of October through December. Larry identified the need for one and possibly two volunteers to attend the November 21 Steering Committee

meeting to represent Management Practices. Linda will be the state representative for Management Practices.

### **C. Q & A's FOR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES WORKGROUP**

A response to a comment from a participant at the Judicial Conference had not been provided. The comment was, "Uniformity statewide would be hard and next to impossible!" The Workgroup agreed to respond with the following:

*Response:* We concur that having all the commissioners on the same page would be beneficial. Pursuing this further would be part of the Next Steps activity, and the recommendation would be to involve representatives from the Judicial Council.

### **D. COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS**

Each recommendation in the cost/benefit analysis was reviewed and rated. This product will become Chapter 4 of the Draft Final Report.

### **E. DRAFT FINAL REPORT**

Larry provided a high-level review of each section of the Draft Final Report and the documents attached as appendices. The group discussed at length whether to include the county survey as an attachment because the report will be placed on the Internet. The majority decided that, because the survey was a working document, it should not be distributed as an attachment.

Lisa walked the group through the changes she had made to the Draft Final Report. The goal was to come to a final agreement as to its contents so it can move forward for final editing.

Larry described the editing process. Concern was raised and addressed about ensuring that the report stays true to our discussions and the intent is not changed through editing. To guarantee consistency, Nora, Terry, Lisa, and Linda volunteered to be points of contact for "peer" reviews. The intent of the editing process is to only polish and make statements easier to read without changing the meaning. If Nora, Linda, Terry, and Lisa have any questions or concerns, they will call or email other team members for clarification. On Nov 7, once the editing process is completed, the report will be sent to all members after final review.

### **F. NEXT STEPS (CHAPTER 5 OF THE DRAFT FINAL REPORT)**

1. Create an ongoing advisory committee on MP to replicate the workgroup consistency.
2. Get specific on how to create the ongoing partnership between state and counties.
3. Establish uniformity in data definition, data collection, and data analysis.
4. Establish priorities for areas to standardize:
  - Performance measures

- DCSS highest priorities
  - Core processes
5. Select a county to perform an administrative paternity establishment and resolution process.
  6. DCSS look at uniformity and recommend legislation to allow counties to use “offer and compromise on arrears” – create standard options in certain cases to resolve debt/obligations
  7. Regarding criminal prosecution, develop ways to streamline and smooth the relationship between DA and counties, e.g., MOUs, sanctions when warranted.
  8. DCSS take leadership role in acquiring access to criminal information, e.g., MOUs, study other state models

#### **G. ATTACHMENTS**

None.

#### **H. ACTION ITEMS**

1. Lisa will make the changes to the final report as noted in today’s workgroup meeting. She will forward these to Larry to begin the QA process.
2. Kevin will submit the attorney minority opinion to Larry by October 31.
3. Larry will return the final draft of the report to the workgroup on or about November 2.
4. Larry will broach the issue of two MP representatives at the Tuesday Management meeting.